A

REPORT

OF THE

Present State

OF THE

Differences in *Doctrinals*,

BETWEEN SOME

Dissenting Ministers

IN

LONDON,

In a LETTER to a Friend in the Country.

LONDON:

Printed for *Nath. Hiller* in *Leaden-Hall-Street*, at the *Princes-Arms* over against St. *Mary-Ax*, 1697.

A

REPORT

OF THE

Present State

OF THE

Differences in Doctrinals,

BETWEEN SOME

Dissenting Ministers

IN

LONDON.

In a LETTER to a Friend in the Country.

LONDON:

Printed for Mark Hiller in Leadenhall-Street, at the Princes-Arms over against St. Mary-Ax.

1697.

Worthy Sir,

MAtters of Fact, touching the present Controversie between our Brethren in the City, are quite otherwise than as they appear to be in the Country: It is not about *Church-Order* but *Doctrinals*; and may be reduced to Two General Heads, *viz. Christ's Satisfaction*, and the *Penal Sanction of the Law*: Tho hitherto the greatest struggle hath been about the *first*, unto which my *Papers* confine me.

That you may frame a just Conception of it, it must be Remark'd, That after sundry Attempts made by the *Industrious Pacificators*, an Instrument was pitch'd upon, which gave satisfaction to the most Learned of each Party. This *Paper* was sent by six or seven of the biggest Name amongst them, who do, or at least have gone under the Denomination of *Presbyterians*, unto some *Congregational* Ministers, and gladly embraced by them.

When Matters were brought to this Head, nothing but a *Re-union*, and a general Amnesty was in prospect, which had ensued, had it not been for two or three Opposers, one of which number calling this *Pacifick Paper*, and those *Peaceable Endeavours* into Question, offered a *Second*, which was compared with the *First*, and out of them a *Third* was taken, and sent from some Brethren, who meet at *Little St. Hellens*, unto them who had for some time, absented themselves from that Place.

This *Third Paper* surprising the *Congregational*, they return'd a short Answer, pressing earnestly, that the *first* Paper might be considered, as what was most likely to compose these Differences. To *this* no Reply hath been, that I can learn, made by the Brethren at St. *Hellens*.

But why did not the *Dissenting Brethren* approve of the *Third* Paper? some of the Reasons assigned I will acquaint you with.

§. I. There is, say they, a Passage in the *first* Paper of extraordinary Importance, which is left out of the *Third*. It is this, *And whereas, in a Book written by Mr.* Williams, *entituled,* Gospel-Truth Stated *and* Vindicated, *it is said* (p. 37, 40, 41.) [There is no change of Persons betwixt Christ and Believers] *which the Learned* Hugo Grotius, *and the Reverend Dr.* Stillingfleet, *now Bishop of* Worcester, *do not only expressly Assert, but irrefragably Prove, in concurrence with the common sentiment of* Protestants; *In as much as we conceive the Doctrine of* Justification *and* Christ's Satisfaction, *on which it depends, cannot be duly Explained and Defended, consistently with the denial of any commutation of Persons between Christ and Believers, We do therefore Declare our disallowance of that Proposition in the general sense thereof.*

This Paragraph, as it contains in it a Charge against Mr. *Williams*, falls not now under Consideration, but as in it 'tis asserted, *That a Change of Persons between Christ and us is the common Doctrine of* Protestants; *and that neither Justification, nor Christ's Satisfaction can be duly Explained or Defended consistently with the Denyal of it.*

This then is one thing that grieves the offended Brethren, and occasions their Dislike of the *Third* Paper, *viz.* That in a Day wherein *Socinianisme* is so Rampant, such a Passage as this should be rejected. Had a change of Persons, say they, been but a περιφραξις, a *Barr*, a Hedge about the Doctrine of *Christ's Satisfaction*, to keep Men off, far off from making Invasions on it, the Explosion would have amazed them: But a commutation or change of Persons being so essential to a proper Satisfaction, that without it there can be no such thing, they dread what the Pursuances hereof are like to be, and judge themselves the more obliged to insist on the *First* Paper, in which the necessity of a change of Persons is so distinctly and expresly asserted. This

This being the very Hinge on which the Controversie between the *Orthodox* and *Socinians* doth turn, who can blame them for their stiff adherence to the Truth in this particular? If one Link of the Chain of Truth be given up in an instance of this kind, its defence is become impossible. If there be no change of Persons between Christ and us, there can be no translation of the *Guilt*, nor a just infliction of the Punishment of our Sins on Christ, that is, there can be no proper *satisfaction*.

We are all by Nature under the Curse of the Law, and destitute of a Righteousness entituling to Eternal Life. This is our *state* and *condition*: This is the *place* in which we are, in which if we die, we are eternally undone. For *vindictive Justice*, which is essential unto God, makes it necessary that the Wrath be inflicted; and that there be no right to Eternal Life without a *Perfect meritorious righteousness*.

That all who believe, might escape the Wrath to come, and have Everlasting Life, the Lord Jesus undertakes for us, by making *satisfaction* both to *positive* and *remunerative* Justice; and that he might do so, he put himself into our *place*, *state* and *condition*; so that, whereas we were *Sin* and under a *Curse*, by this blessed *change*, Christ is made *Sin* and a *Curse*, and we delivered from *Sin* and the *Curse*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Gal.* 3. 13.

This is the substance of the Gospel of Christ, this the Ground and Foundation of our Faith. Without this, our Preaching and your Believing is vain. So necessary is the Assertion of a Change of Persons between Christ and us, you see, that consistently with the denial of it, it cannot be truly said, that Christ was made *Sin*, made a *Curse*; or that he took on him the *person of sinners*, and in their person bore their Guilt, and endured their Punishment, that is to say, without a change of persons between Christ and us, there is, there can be no proper satisfaction made to God's Justice.

This is one thing, which doth, I perceive, grieve the offend-

offended Brethren; and in the Letter sent from St. *Hellens* to cover the *Third Paper*, there is another Passage, that encreaseth their sorrow, namely [*That, on our so happy establishing the Doctrine of Justification, We* need say but little *to the Point of* Commutation of Persons.] Whereas, on the contrary, it's impossible to establish the Doctrine of Justification on its *true* and *proper Basis*, any otherwise than by clearing the Point of *Commutation of Persons*. For if no Commutation of Persons between Christ and us, there can be no imputation of our sin to Christ, or of Christ's Righteousness to us, there can be no Justification by imputed Righteousness. But to their second Reason.

§. II. The *Third Paper* say they, doth not only expunge the Paragraph about the *necessity* of a *commutation*; but doth also reject those *Terms* and *Phrases*, used by the *Orthodox* to explain Christ's Satisfaction, such as, Christ's being our *surety*, his coming into our place *so* as to *take on him our Person, and satisfie the obligations of the violated Law of Works for us*, which is the more grievous to 'em, in that it hath been the common way taken to introduce such Opinions in matters Religious, as have proved hurtful to the Church of God.

§. III. There is such a *wrong description* given of a *change of Persons*, in the *Third Paper*, as perverts the Doctrine of Satisfaction.

That you may see the force of this reason, I will offer *their sense* in the words of some one or other of themselves, as now before me in *Manuscript*, who in a Letter to a Learned Person, sets down the excepted Passage, and by Argument attacques it. 'Tis thus:

Of a Commutation of Persons. As we are to consider our Lord Jesus Christ, in his obedience and sufferings as God-Man, invested with the Office of a Mediatour, *so it is apparent, this* commutation *of Persons is to be understood in a* legal *or* judicial *sense (as we may call it) he by agreement between the Father and him, came into our room and stead, to answer for our violation of the Law of Works.*]

'Here, saith he, 'tis to be observed, That when we discourse of a *commutation of Persons*, we are to consider our Lord Jesus, God-Man, (who is invested with the Office of Mediator) as *our Surety* in the execution of his Priestly Office, which is but a part of his Mediatorial Undertaking. The Wording it then after this manner, seems to be calculated for their *Meridian*, who hold, that Christ suffered only in the Person of a *Mediator*, *not in the Person of sinners*; for which reason we may easily perceive why there must not be in this *Third Paper*, the least mention of *Christ's Suretiship*; or of his *sustaining the person of sinners*, agreeably hereunto.

'2. The Account given of a *Commutation* is thus, [*It is to be understood in a* Legal *or* Judicial *sense, as we may call it.*] Not that it is really in a *Legal* or *Judicial sense*, only we may so call it. They'll not quarrel about the *Term*, may the *thing* they contend for, be granted 'em.

'3. We apprehend this to be their *meaning*; because, in their Explication there is not a Word proper and peculiar to a *commutation* in a *Legal* sense. A *Commutation* in a *legal* sense is the same with a *proper surrogation*, where the *surety* puts on the *Person*, and stands in the *Quality*, *State* and *Condition* of the *Debtor*, and lies under the *same obligation* to answer for him. What more common amongst the Learned than *Subrogatum & sufficium in locum alterius, ejus naturam sortiri*. But in this Paper, [*Christ's putting on the person of sinners*, and his *Undertaking* to answer *for them* the *obligations* of the *Law of Works*.] is left out. And not a Word put into their place that is peculiar to a proper Satisfaction. What, tho Christ died in the Person of a Mediatour to answer for our violation of the Law of Works; yet, if he died not in the *Person of sinners*, to answer *for them* the *obligations* of the violated *Law of works*, he did not, he could not make satisfaction to Vindictive and Remunerative Justice.

§. IV. We cannot but be *grieved* to observe, That this

'*Third Paper*, instead of *Healing*, doth rather *increase* the '*Wound*, by imposing a sense on one of the most offensive 'Passages in the above-mentioned [*State of Gospel Truth*,] 'which is in express contradiction to the very Letter, 'and general scope of the said Book. *It is manifest* (they 'are the words of this Paper) *that when Mr. W. useth 'the Phrase of* [*no* change of Persons between Christ and 'the Elect,] *it could not be intended as a denial of a change 'of Person between Christ and us, in the general sense, but only in* opposition *to the Opinion of his Adversary he wrote 'against*: *For in that very place he expressly affirms, that 'Christ Suffered and Dyed in our Stead.* To this we answer.

1. 'That his Denial of a change of Persons between 'Christ and the Elect, or between him and believers, is 'so express and full, that he leaves no room for a *distinction*, *limitation* or *restriction*, or for an owning it in any 'sense. His Words are as exclusive of a *change of Persons* 'in every sense, as Words can be. He saith it again and 'again, *There is no change of Person between Christ and Believers*, *Gosp. Tru. stated*, *p.* 37, 40, 41. The negation of 'a *change* is so general, that unless *No Change* signifie *A 'Change*; and a *negative* is of the same import with an '*affirmative*, *Yea* and *Nay* are words of the same signification, you will never be able to find him allowing of a '*change of person* between Christ and us in a *legal*, or in 'any other sense, except Metaphorical and imperfect, 'which in Truth is no *real Change*.

2. 'Seeing the *Testimonial* prefixed to his Book, con'tains in it a Declaration, *That the Subscribers do judge the 'Author hath in all that is material, rightly and fully stated 'the Truths and Errours mentioned as such*, 'tis reasonably 'supposed, that in stating this Point, the Author hath 'not omitted any one *Distinction* if at all material; and 'yet without any *distinction* he hath oft declared in the 'general, *There is* No Change of Person *between Christ and 'us*. How then can any say, *It could not be intended of a 'denyal of a* change *in the general sense*?

3. 'Where-

5. 'Whereas 'tis added, *It must be taken only as intended against the Opinion of his Adversary against whom he wrote*, 'tis Replied.

'If this had been really the Intention of the Author, as he should not have delivered his sense by such Negations of a *change*, as exclude every *change*; so in a *state* that is *right* and *full*, in all that is material, he should have told us the sense in which his Adversary affirm'd a *change*. But thus much he hath done no otherwise than by saying in the *General*, his Adversary holds *a change*, and he denies it. *The difference* (saith he) *lieth in these Points*, 1. *Whether there be a* change *of person between Christ and the Elect, yea, or between Christ and Believers?* This *the Doctor* (*viz.* his Adversary) *affirms and I deny. Gosp. Tr. Stated*, p. 40. Thus you see the difference between him and his Adversary is, *Whether there be* a change *or* no change *in the general?* *A change*, saith his Adversary; *No change* saith he. Is it possible for the Wit of Man to *invent* Words more expressive of the *denial* of a *change* in the *general sense* than our Author hath done?

'But it's said, *In that very place he expressly affirms, That Christ Suffered and Dyed in our Stead.* In Return hereunto it must be observed.

1. 'That our Modern Innovators have assumed to themselves the Prerogative of imposing an Heterodox Sense on found Terms and Phrases, and that these words [*In our Place and Stead*] do not with many now-a-days, signifie a *surrogation*, or a *proper change of persons* in a *legal sense*, but imports no more than for our *good* and *benefit*.

2. 'That tho *Socinus* and *Crellius*, who granted, that there was a *Metaphorical*, or rather an *improper change* of persons, vehemently opposed the use of these Phrases, *vice nostrâ*, *loco nostro*, in our *place* and *stead*.] 'because they looked on 'em to signifie what in truth they do, to wit, a *surrogation*, or a proper change of Persons; yet now the *English Socinians* are of another Mind,

'Mind, Declaring, *That the great Point in Controverſie, between them*, and us, *turns not on the Words* [*in our ſtead.*] *That Men of the* Racovian *way do conſider our Saviour, as ſuffering for us, and in our ſtead*, Agreem. of Un. *Page* 39. So that, to vindicate One, who, in expreſs Words denies a change of Perſons, its not enough to ſay, that *Chriſt ſuffred in our ſtead*; for, you ſee, this *Phraſe* is uſed by them, who are moſt ſet againſt a Surrogation, or Change of Perſons betwixt Chriſt, and us, and may Import no more than that, *if the Lord Chriſt had not ſuffered, we ſhould have been Puniſh't*; which is conſiſtent enough with the Aſſertion of *Socinus* and his Admirers. But,

3. 'That our Author takes theſe Terms [*in our Place, and Stead*] in a Senſe, which doth not interfere with his Denying a change of Perſons in the General, ſeems clear from his ridiculing Dr. *Criſpe* for affirming a change of Perſons upon this Ground, that Chriſt ſuffred in our ſtead. '[*Becauſe Chriſt ſuffered in our ſtead, therefore, ſaith he, the Dr. thinks there is a change of Perſon*, Goſp. Tr. Stat. *p.* 52.] whereas if by the Words [*in our ſtead*] he meant a change of Perſons, he could never have aſſigned this as the Reaſon of the Doctors miſtake; nothing being more plain and eaſie than to conclude, that if Chriſt *ſuffered in our ſtead*, there was a change of Perſon between Chriſt and us. Thus far the Author of my Manuſcript.

By this time you may underſtand, what have been the Matters in Difference betwixt our Brethren in the City? And what it is that hath hindred a Re-Union; namely, an Apprehenſion, that the Author of *Goſpel Truth Stated* doth in ſome Inſtances forſake the Truth, and that the Names ſet to the Teſtimonial prefix'd to his Book gave too much Countenance thereunto: Beſides, I muſt add, that their Diſſatisfaction hath been encreaſed, by the appearing backwardneſs in ſome, either to teſtifie againſt the Errours charged on the offenſive Book; or,

to

to condescend so far as to Examine whether the Charge be true, tho their Names are unto the Attestation set before it. Once more, they, who rejected the *first* Paper, tho it hath nothing in it but an Impartial Stating the Truth, as it lies between the *Antimonian*, the *Arminian*, and *Socinian* Extreams, and is most aptly adjusted to a Joyous Conciliation in Matters Doctrinal, have thereby added to the Grief of our offended Brethren. But it must be withal Remark'd, that they who are against the Doctrines contained in the first Paper are but a very small number, and not one of the biggest Character that I can on the strictest Scrutiny observe. And that you may be the more able to Judge aright of this Matter, there is nothing further needful than to consult the first Paper, which I here send you as it came to my Hands.

The First Paper.

'WHereas some unhappy Differences have arisen amongst us, principally about the Doctrine of Justification, occasioned by a Book, Written by Mr. *Williams*, Intituled, *Gospel Truth Stated and Vindicated*, to which some of our Names were prefix'd, and against which several Exceptions were made by Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Cole*, Mr. *Mather*, Mr. *Chauncey*, Mr. *Traile*, and Mr. *Richard Taylor*, which if continued amongst the Ministers of Christ may be much to the Dishonour of God, and Danger to the Souls of Men.

'For the Composing whereof, as we formerly expressed our Approbation of the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of *England*, or the Confession of Faith, compiled by the Assembly at *Westminster*, or that at the *Savoy*, as agreeable to the Word of God, unto that Approbation we still adhere: Declaring further, that if any of us shall at any Time hereafter be apprehended to have express'd himself disagreeing thereunto, we will with Brotherly Candour and Kindness, mutually endea-

endeavour to give, and receive just Satisfaction herein: Bearing with one anothers Infirmities, and different Sentiments about *Logical*, or *Philosophical Terms*, or meerly *Humane Forms of Speech*, in Matters of *lesser Weight*: Not thinking it reasonable or just to Charge upon any Brother such Consequences of any Expression, or Opinion of his, which he himself shall Disown.

'And We do further Declare, with respect to the special Matters in Difference amongst us; that, *Altho Regeneration, Repentance towards God, Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and Holy Conversation are by Gods express Word manifestly necessary to the Salvation of a Sinner*; yet, that none of these, *or any Work done by Men, or wrought by the Spirit of God in them, is under the Notion of Subordination, or under any Denomination whatsoever, any Part of that Righteousness for the sake, or on the account whereof God doth Pardon, Justifie, or accept Sinners, or entitle them to Eternal Life*; *that being only the Righteousness of Jesus Christ without them, Imputed unto them, and Received by Faith alone.*

'And whereas, in the above mention'd Book it is said, [*There is no Change of Person betwixt Christ and Believers*] (Page 37, 40, 41.) which the Learned *H. Grotius*, and the Reverend Dr. *Stillingfleet*, now Bishop of *Worcester*, do not only Assert, but Irrefragably Prove, in Concurrence with the *Common Sentiment of Protestants*; in as much as we *conceive the Doctrine of Justification, and of Christs Satisfaction, on which it depends cannot be duly Explained and Defended, consistently with the Denial of any* Commutation *of* Persons *between Christ, and Believers.*

'We do therefore Declare our *Disallowance* of that Proposition in the general Sense thereof, giving our Sense thus. That as it is Apparent, this cannot be a *Physical* Change, by which Christ and Believers do in *Substance* become one another: Nor again a *Moral* Change, whereby Christ should become *inherently* sin-

'ful,

'ful, and Believers become immediately thereby Inno-
'cent, and Sinleſs: So, we doubt not, there is a Com-
'mutation of Perſons in a *Legal Senſe*, Chriſt by Con-
'ſent between the Father, and Him, *Putting on the Per-*
'*ſon, and coming into the Room, and Stead of Sinners*;
'not to Repent, or Believe for them, which the Go-
'ſpel requires (tho He hath undertaken the Elect ſhall
'in due time be enabled hereunto) but to *Anſwer for*
'*them the Obligations of the violated Law of Works, Being*
'*made Sin for them, tho He knew no Sin, that they might*
'*be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*, 2 Cor. 5. 21.
'And *what is contrary hereunto, we Judge Erroneous and*
'*Falſe.*

'And as there is a Change of Perſons betwixt Chriſt
'and Believers, ſo the *guilt of our Iniquities being laid*
'*upon Chriſt*, the Father was *diſpleaſed* with him. Not
'that He was ever moved to any Paſſion againſt Him,
'which in the General, the Perfection of the Divine
'Nature admits not, on any account whatſoever; nor
'that he was in any Senſe offended with him, much
'leſs abhorr'd him, conſidered as He was in himſelf,
'for ſo he was moſt perfectly ſinleſs; but conſidered
'*in Relation to us*, as our *Surety*, bearing our Sins in his
'own Body; *ſo*, if by *Diſpleaſure*, or *Wrath*, be only
'meant [a *Diſpaſſionate Will to Puniſh*] the Lord
'Chriſt did *Feel, and Bear* the *Diſpleaſure* of God, *and*
'*the weight of his Wrath*, in *the Puniſhment of our Sins*,
'*transferr'd upon him*; for it pleaſed the Father to bruiſe
'him, having laid upon him the Iniquities of us all.
'And we do further Declare, that whoſoever ſhall be
'found to expreſs themſelves in their Preaching or
'Writings agreeably hereto, and the mentioned Ar-
'ticles, and Confeſſions, we ſhall eſteem them to deli-
'ver the Sincere Goſpel of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus
'Chriſt. And it ſhall be remote from us to oppoſe,
'or reflect upon: But we ſhall to our uttermoſt encou-
'rage and give Countenance to one anothers Miniſtry
'herein.

If

'If therefore Mr. *Williams* ſhall concur with us in 'what we have declared touching the *Doctrine of Juſtification*, and in the ſenſe we have given of a *change* 'of perſons between Chriſt and Believers, and of *Chriſt's* 'enduring the diſpleaſure of the Father for our ſins; and 'ſhall give ſatisfaction about any thing elſe that any 'Brother excepts againſt in the reſt of his Writings, 'agreeably to the aboveſaid Articles and Confeſſions, 'We ſhall ſo far acquieſce therein, as not to make them 'the matter of further Publick Conteſt or Altercation 'amongſt our ſelves.

This is the *Firſt Paper* that was offered as an Expedient for the compoſing thoſe Differences which are amongſt our *London* Brethren; in which you cannot but obſerve the Air of a moſt Chriſtian Temper, a combination of Peaceable Principles, together with a clear and candid ſtating the great Doctrines of Chriſt's Goſpel. This is the Paper in which our offended Brethren rejoiced; and it was the Rejecting *This Paper*, that fill'd them both with *Grief* and *Wonder*. That a Paper ſo happily compoſed for the healing the *Wound*, ſhould meet with the leaſt check, could not but aſtoniſh and afflict them.

However, to the All-Wiſe God be rendred *Honour* and *Glory*, that the indefatigable Pains of the Pacificators have iſſued in ſo happy an Agreement of the *moſt Godly*, *Learned* and *Judicious Miniſters* in and about this City. This is ſo great a Mercy, that 'tis pity the Country ſhould be altogether unacquainted with it. Take therefore the Names of ſuch of 'em as came to my hands, with this caution, That I *not being able to procure* a Liſt *of all*, we *muſt not eſteem every one, whoſe Name is not here inſerted*, to be *againſt this Paper*, for I cannot learn, that there are Five Paſtors of Churches Diſſenting from it.

The

The Names of them whose Hands were set before Mr. *Williams* his Book, and Subscribed this *Paper*:

W. Bates D. D. *John Howe*, *Rich. Stretton*, *V. Alsop*, *J. Shower*, *D. Burgesse*, *S. Slater*, *J. Quick*, *D. Evans*.

I have not sent you what was Drawn up to signifie how far their Approval was to be extended, for some having seen the Book, and others not, and some extending their Attestation further than others did, the same Words were insufficient to express their sundry senses. But the other Brethren did unanimously deliver their Sentiments thus:

We who subscribed not our Names to the Testimonial Prefixed to Mr. Williams's *Book, are glad to find so good an Agreement amongst us as this Paper doth expresi.*

George Griffith, Matthew Barker, Matthew Mead, John James, Isaac Chauncey, Richard Wavel, Edw. Terrey, Edw. Veale, Rob. Traile, Jos. Hill, Rob. Franklin, Jos. Cawthorne, Stephen Lobb, Richard Taylor, Franc. Glascocke, Walter Crosse, Tho. Rowe, Thomas Goodwin, Thomas Gouge, John Nesbit, Jonathan Owen, J. Walker, Matt. Clarke.

There were several others who expressed their Approbation of this *Paper*, such as Dr. *Annesley*, Mr. *Will. Taylor*, Mr. *Beverly*; and Mr. *George Hammond* himself said, That he had nothing to object against it, but might it be a Mean to Restore the Union, he would gladly set his Hand unto it. I am

Sir,

July 14. 97. Yours——

Advertisement.

Pietas in Patriam: Or, The Life of Sir *William Phips*, Late Captain General, and Governour in Chief of the Province of the *Massachuset-Bay New-England*. Containing the Memorable Changes undergone, and Actions perform'd by him, together with an Account of his Conversion. Printed for *Nath. Hiller* at the *Princes-Arms* in *Leaden-Hall Street*, over against St. *Mary-Ax*. Price Bound 1 s.